

2008-2009 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant Scoring Rubric

All the criteria in Part 1 must be met. If even one is not met then the project is put aside and will not be scored. If a criterion is satisfied, then it will be scored. Reviewers will be required to explain in detail reasons for their scores. If all the criteria in Part I are met, further points can be earned in Part II, for a total of 200 points.

Part I

Plan of Work

The proposal describes a plan that convincingly demonstrates how the proposed professional development will address the targeted activities set forth by the MSP program. The proposal provides sufficiently detailed **explanation of how these activities are expected to strengthen the quality of mathematics and science instruction** and improve student academic achievement. Includes a description of how the plan is **based on a review of scientifically based research**.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-6 pts.** _____ (1poor→6 ideal)

Descriptions of teacher quality and **professional development needs** of each eligible building that is supported with qualitative and/or quantitative data. This includes either information from the Survey of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) or there is a plan to administer the SEC at the start of the project.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-3 pts.** _____ (1poor→3 ideal)

There is evidence that the activities **align with challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards in mathematics and science** and with other educational reform activities that promote student academic achievement in mathematics and science.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-2 pts.** _____ (1poor→2 ideal)

Partnership

A partnership with **STEM faculty and eligible schools** is clearly evident throughout the proposal. The proposal describes how the partners will share the work and how their work will be integrated into the on-going work of both the local schools and the STEM department. There is evidence that the partnership has the capability of managing the project.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-6 pts.** _____ (1poor→6 ideal)

Sustainability

Describes how the partnership will continue the activities funded under this part after the original grant period has expired.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-2 pts.** _____ (1poor→2 ideal)

Evaluation Plan

An **evaluation and accountability plan** that includes rigorous objectives that measure the impact of the activities of the project.

☐ Not met

☐ Met

enter rating: **1-6 pts.** _____ (1poor→6 ideal)

All Criteria Met _____ (Fill in total points and continue to Part II.)

All Criteria Not Met _____ (Explain)

Total Points from Part I: _____ x 5 = _____ (125 pts. possible)
(25 pts. possible)

2008-2009 Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant Scoring Rubric

Part II

If all the criteria from Part I are met, applicants can earn further points by discussing the following:

Budget Detail

The proposed budget is realistic for the described plan and enables the partnership to obtain the expected outcomes.

1-6 pts. _____ (1poor→6 ideal)

Appendix

The appendix contains resumes of key faculty and staff and letters of interest from partnering STEM departments.

1-3 pts. _____ (1poor→3 ideal)

Partnerships

There is evidence that the Michigan Mathematics and Science Network Centers are core partners in the proposal.

1-6 pts. _____ (1poor→6 ideal)

Total Points from Part II: _____ **x 5 =** _____ **(75 pts. possible)**
(15 pts. possible)

Total Part II points _____ **(75)**

Total Part I points _____ **(125)**

Total _____ **(200)**